

Mr. MUNDT. Yes, but it is attached to the economic aid part of the bill. If we are to have a Commission with only that many committee members on it, no committee will have adequate representation to provide any cross section of views at all.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the Senator from Nebraska will permit me to say so—

Mr. HRUSKA. Certainly.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I did not intend to increase the number at all. I simply said the Vice President should be able to choose from members on the three committees, rather than merely the one.

Mr. MUNDT. I think it is important to increase the size of the committee if that is to be done, because, for example, on the Foreign Relations Committee, as the Senator knows, each of us is more or less typed as having certain ideas on economic aid. If the Vice President were to select one member from each of the committees, the decision could be predetermined in advance. By increasing the number, it could be expected that there would be some pros and some cons.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I think the supporters of the amendment failed to read it carefully. I see the possibility that, under the amendment, the committee might investigate the CIA, in which case it would be most dangerous to have four members of the Committee on Foreign Relations on it. We might wish to take that into account, because section 3, on page 2, reads:

Assistance for political or contingency purposes, to be extended to a limited number of countries or areas

That might very well involve the CIA. It would be most dangerous to have four members of the Foreign Relations Committee on such a committee.

Mr. HRUSKA. That is a very interesting observation, particularly in view of the recent debate on the floor on that general subject which had an unfortunate termination so far as the viewpoint just expressed is concerned.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, in addition to what the senior Senator from Massachusetts just said about the Committee on Foreign Relations, I point out that in 1964, food for peace provided 33 percent of our foreign aid. In 1965 it was 28 percent. In 1966 it was 20 percent. Considering these facts, why should not the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry have a berth on this committee?

Mr. HRUSKA. I see no reason why not. To narrow this committee down for a study and investigation of such monumental scope and to limit the committee to four members of only one committee seems to me to make it a little bit off balance, in fact very ill balanced.

I point that out as an added reason why I do not propose to vote for the amendment.

FOIAb3b